

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action mailed September 25, 2008. Claims 17-19, 21-23, 25-29, 31-33 and 35-40 are pending in the application and are rejected. Applicant responds to the rejection of claims 17-19, 21-23, 25-29, 31-33 and 35-40 and the Office Action as follows.

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 36, 39, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 36, 39 and 40 are cancelled and accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 36, 39 and 40 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 17 is amended to recite engaging the inner portion of the clamp through a slot between flange segments of the clamping interface and applying a force to the inner portion of the clamp to remove the clamp from the clamping interface, which is believed proper under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Claim 17 is not rejected other than under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph and accordingly allowance thereof as amended is respectfully requested.

Response to Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 21-23, 25-29, 31-33, 35, 37-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Ng, U.S. Patent No. 7,215,509. Claims 37 is cancelled in this Amendment. Applicant responds to the rejection of claims 21-23, 25-29, 31-33, 35 and 38 as follows.

As set forth in the Office Action, claim 21 is rejected on the basis that Ng teaches “supplying an outward force in a first direction (194, downward Y-direction) via contacting engagement with an assembly tool (188) against an inner portion (154) of a clamp (200) as shown in Fig. 8; and supplying a clamping force in a second direction (194, upward Y-direction) different from the first direction (such as an opposite direction) to disengage the inner portion of the clamp from the assembly tool. . . . as shown in Figs. 10-12”. Office Action, page 4. As

amended claim 21 recites supplying a clamping force in a second direction generally transverse to the first direction to disengage the inner portion of the clamp from the assembly tool, thereby reducing the opening to install the clamp over a flange of a clamping interface”. Claim 21 as amended, includes supplying a clamping force in a second direction generally transverse to the first direction. Movement of the assembly tool 188 of Ng in the upward Y-direction 194 is not generally transverse to movement of the assembly tool 188 in the downward Y-direction 194. Ng does not teach nor suggest each of the recited claim elements of amended claim 21 and accordingly allowance thereof is respectfully requested. Claims 23, 25, 27, 29, 32 and 33 are dependent upon claim 21 and are allowable *inter alia* based upon their dependency on claim 21.

On page 4, the Office Action provides “[a]s per claim 16 the clamping interface includes a spindle portion (108, as shown in Fig. 1) rotatable relative to a hub and at least one disc (110) is assembled relative to the spindle portion prior to supplying the force to install the clamp as shown in Figs. 4-9”. Claim 16 was previously cancelled and accordingly clarification regarding the recited rejection with respect to claim 16 in the Office Action is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 recites *inter alia* supplying an outward force in a first direction to an inner portion of a clamp via an assembly tool and releasing the clamp from the assembly tool by supplying a clamping force in a second direction towards a clamping interface where the second direction is different from the first direction to install the clamp into a recessed groove of the clamping interface. Claim 26 was rejected on the basis that Ng discloses that the “clamping force is supplied while inner (190) and outer tools (192) engages the inner and outer portions of the clamp as shown in Fig 8”. This rejection on its face recites the claim language of claim 26 as previously presented and fails to consider the amended claim language of claim 26.

As stated in the Office Action, assuming that the outward force in the first direction is in the downward Y-direction 194 as shown in Ng, and the clamping force is in a second upward Y- direction 194, movement of the deflection tool 190 of Ng in the upward and downward Y- directions does not teach each of the recited claim elements, since in claim 26, the second direction is towards the clamping interface and the upward Y-direction 194 of Ng is

directed away from the clamping interface. Based upon the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of amended claim 26. Claims 22 and 38 are dependent upon claim 26 and are allowable *inter alia* based upon their dependency upon claim 26.

Claim 28 as amended recites positioning a clamp proximate to a spindle assembly, supplying an outward force in a first direction to an inner portion of the clamp, supplying a clamping force in a second direction to the clamp along an inverted portion of the clamp spaced from inner and outer edges of the clamp wherein the second direction is different from the first direction and in a direction towards the spindle assembly. Although, claim 28 was previously indicated to be allowable over Ng, claim 28 is now rejected on the basis that Ng teaches “an inverted spring portion (a slopped tip portion) of the clamp is snap fitting into the groove of the clamping interface as shown in Fig. 9”. Office Action, page 4.

Assuming that retraction of deflection portion 190 of the assembly tool in the upward Y-direction 194 as discussed above teaches supplying a clamping force in a second upward Y-direction, movement of the assembly tool in the upward Y-direction 194 does not teach nor suggest the step of supplying a clamping force in a second direction different from the first direction where the second direction is towards the spindle assembly, since the upward Y-direction 194 of Ng is directed away from the spindle assembly. Based upon the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 28. Claims 31 and 35 are dependent upon claim 28 and are allowable *inter alia* based upon their dependency upon claim 28.

Response to Allowable subject Matter

On page 6, ¶ 6, the Office Action provides that claims 18-19 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In the Office Action, only claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph. Claims 18-19 are dependent upon claim 21 and not claim 17. Accordingly, clarification regarding rejection of claims 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph is respectfully requested.

New claims 41-44 are added. Favorable action with respect to new claims 41-44 is

respectfully requested.

The Director is authorized to charge any fee deficiency required by this paper or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-1123.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTMAN, CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.

By: /Deirdre Megley Kvale/
Deirdre Megley Kvale, Reg. No. 35,612
900 Second Avenue South, Suite 1400
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-3319
Phone: (612) 334-3222 Fax: (612) 334-3312

DMK:rev